

## In This Issue

This issue opens with a symposium on “Community Conflicts and the State in India.” AMRITA BASU and ATUL KOHLI frame the three articles of this symposium with a thought-provoking introduction and conclusion.

ATUL KOHLI offers a general theoretical model to explain the rise and decline of three recent ethnic movements. JOYTIRINDRA DASGUPTA shifts the focus to ethnic conflicts in the northeastern states in order to highlight their role in both the formation of communities and the development of linkages to wider political institutions. MARY FAINSOD KATZENSTEIN, UDAY SINGH MEHTA, and USHA THAKKAR investigate the emergence of the Shiv Sena in Maharashtra by highlighting its institutional development as well as its shifting discursive strategies.

NANCY ABELMANN reexamines the issue of class identities in South Korea by developing a “gendered, transgenerational social mobility perspective” and relating one family’s story. By including women in discussions of class and social mobility, specifically their roles as economic producers and as contributors to class identities, she aims at transcending the limitations of studies that have concentrated exclusively on the occupations of men. And by pursuing the transgenerational context of people’s lives as well as an individual’s life, she unravels the complex relationship existing between subjective understandings of mobility across generations and within an individual’s life and changing socioeconomic conditions in the post-Korean War period.

PHILIP C. BROWN reexamines the issue of the “reunification” of Japan under Toyotomi Hideyoshi and his Tokugawa successors by looking at the land surveys undertaken by Hideyoshi, the so-called Taikō *kenchi*. Rather than accept the Taikō *kenchi* as an example of political centralization, he challenges the widely held view that these surveys introduced a largely new and uniform system of land tenure characterized by a direct connection between the individual peasant cultivator linked in the survey and specific plots of land. Based on a careful examination particularly of the practice of land repartition (*warichi*) and its variations in three areas, he shows that the control of land tenures remained primarily in village hands, that land tenure practices were not unified under Hideyoshi, and that the ties between farm households and individual plots of land were never clear-cut. Thus, he urges a reevaluation of the early Tokugawa period as an era of state building.